	1	Jennifer L. Kelly (CSB No. 193416) jkelly@fenwick.com	Elizabeth Cabraser (CSB No. 83151) ecabraser@lchb.com
	2	Aaron K. Perzanowski (CSB No. 244921)	Eric B. Fastiff (CSB No. 182260)
	3	aperzanowski@fenwick.com FENWICK & WEST LLP	efastiff@lchb.com Allison Elgart (CSB No. 241901)
	3	555 California Street, 12th Floor	aelgart@lchb.com
	4	San Francisco, CA 94104	LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &
	5	Telephone: (415) 875-2300 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350	BERNSTEIN, LLP 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
	3	, ,	San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
	6	Peter J. Eliasberg (CSB No. 189110)	Telephone: 415-956-1000
	7	peliasberg@aclu-sc.org Peter Bibring (CSB No. 223981)	Facsimile: 415-956-1008 (fax)
		pbibring@aclu-sc.org	Interim Class Counsel for MCI Class
	8	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN	Joshua Graeme Whitaker
	9	CALIFORNIA	(Appearing pursuant to MDL Rule 1.4 [U.S.
	10	1616 Beverly Boulevard	Dist. Ct. for the Dist. of Md. Bar No. 16457])
	10	Los Angeles, CA 90026 Telephone: (213) 977-9500	joshuawhitaker@griffinwhitaker.com
	11	Facsimile: (213) 250-3919	Edward Nelson Griffin
	12	Nicole A. Ozer (CSB No. 228643)	(Appearing pursuant to MDL Rule 1.4 [U.S. Dist. Ct. for the Dist. of Md. Bar No. 16435])
LP	12	nozer@aclunc.org	edwardgriffin@griffinwhitaker.com
FENWICK & WEST LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO	13	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION	GRIFFIN WHITAKER LLP
	14	FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	8730 Georgia Avenue Suite LL100
		39 Drumm Street	Silver Spring, MD 20910
	15	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 621-2493	Telephone: (301) 587-3345 Facsimile: (888) 367-0383
	16	Facsimile: (4150 255-8437	1 desimile. (000) 307 0303
	17	Attorneys for Plaintiffs in	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
	1 /	Dennis P. Riordan, <i>et al.</i>	Christopher Bready, et al.
	18		
	19		
	20	Ronald L. Motley	David H. Sternlieb
	20	rmotley@motleyrice.com	dsternlieb@shapirosternlieb.com
	21	Jodi W. Flowers	Gary S. Shapiro
	22	jflowers@motleyrice.com Don Migliori	gshapiro@shapirosternlieb.com (Appearing pursuant to MDL Rule 1.4) (U.S.
		dmigliori@motleyrice.com	Dist. Ct. for the Dist. of N.J.)
	23	Justin B. Kaplan jkaplan@motleyrice.com	SHAPIRO & STERNLIEB, LLC Attorneys At Law
	24	MOTLEY RICE LLC	800 Tennent Road
	25	28 Bridgeside Boulevard P. O. Box 1792	Manalapan, New Jersey 07726 Telephone: (732) 617-8050
	23	Mount Pleasant, SC 29465	Facsimile: (732) 617-8060
	26	Telephone: (843) 216-9000	
	27	Facsimile: (843) 216-9440	
		Interim Class Counsel for	Counsel for
	28	Verizon Class	Plaintiffs Glen Chulsky, et al.

MDL NO. 06-1791 VRW

DECLARATION OF CANDACE J. MOREY

DECLARATION OF CANDACE J. MOREY

I, CANDACE J. MOREY, declare and state:

- 1. I am a member in good standing of the State Bar of California, and admitted to practice in this district. I am an associate in the law firm of Fenwick & West, LLP which is counsel for plaintiffs Dennis P. Riordan, et al., in this multidistrict litigation proceeding. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and could and would testify competently thereto if called upon to do so.
 - 2. Attached hereto are true and correct copies of the following documents:
- Exhibit A: Transcript of *President's Radio Address*, December 17, 2005, https://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/print/20051217.html.
- Exhibit B: Transcript of Press Briefing by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and General Michael Hayden, Principal Deputy Director for National Intelligence,

 December 19, 2005,

http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/print/20051219-1.html.

- Exhibit C: Preserving Prosecutorial Independence: Is the Department of Justice Politicizing the Hiring and Firing of U.S. Attorneys? Part IV: Hearing Before the S. Judiciary Comm., 110th Cong. (2007) (testimony of James Comey, Former Deputy Attorney General).
- Exhibit D: Responses to Written Questions to Former Deputy Attorney General James B.

 Comey Submitted by Senator Patrick Leahy May 22, 2007,

 http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200705/052507ComeyResponse.pdf.
- Exhibit E: Wartime Executive Power and the National Security Agency's Surveillance

 Authority: Hearing Before the S. Judiciary Comm., 109th Cong. (2006) (testimony of Alberto Gonzales, U.S. Attorney General).
- Exhibit F: Paul Kane, Ashcroft Tells of Surveillance Disputes, Wash. Post, June 22, 2007, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/21/
 AR2007062101022.html?hpid=moreheadlines.
- Exhibit G: Letter from John Conyers and Jerrold Nadler, U.S. House of Representatives, to

1		Billion, Beating Qwest, N.Y. Times, Feb. 14, 2005.	
2	Exhibit EE:	Excerpts of FCC Industry Analysis and Technology Division Wireline	
3		Competition Bureau, Trends in Telephone Service, (June 21, 2005),	
4	http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common_Carrier/Reports/FCC-State_Link/IAD/trend605.pdf.		
5	Exhibit FF:	Leslie Cauley & John Diamond, Telecoms Let NSA Spy on Calls, USA Today,	
6		Feb. 6, 2006.	
7	Exhibit GG:	Recent Verizon History,	
8		http://investor.verizon.com/profile/history/history_001.aspx, which I caused to be	
9		printed on June 21, 2007.	
10	Exhibit HH:	The Inspector General's Independent Report on the F.B.I.'s Use of National	
11		Security Letters: Hearing Before the H. Judiciary Comm., 110th Cong. (2007)	
12		(testimony of Valerie Caproni, FBI General Counsel and Glenn A. Fine, DOJ	
13		Inspector General).	
14	Exhibit II:	Excerpts of DOJ Office of the Inspector General, A Review of the Federal Bureau	
15		of Investigation's Use of National Security Letters (Mar. 2007),	
16		http://www.usdoj.gov/oig/special/s0703b/final.pdf.	
17	Exhibit JJ:	John Solomon, FBI Finds It Frequently Overstepped in Data Collection, Wash.	
18		Post, June 14, 2007.	
19	Exhibit KK:	Excerpts of U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft, Attorney General's Guidelines	
20		for FBI National Security Investigations and Foreign Intelligence Collection (Oct.	
21		31, 2003), http://www.usdoj.gov/olp/nsiguidelines.pdf .	
22	3.	I am familiar with the records and proceedings in this action, with the exception of	
23	the in camera, ex parte materials submitted to the Court by the Government. Plaintiffs have		
24	diligently developed the factual record relating to their claims. Although Plaintiffs contend that		
25	their pleadings and evidence already set forth in the record of these proceedings are sufficient to		
26	defeat the Government's "motion to dismiss, or, in the alternative, for summary judgment," 06		
27	MDL 1791 Dkt. 253, should the Court believe that critical evidence is missing (whether by		
28	operation of the state secrets privilege or otherwise), Plaintiffs respectfully submit that further		
	DECLARATIO	N OF CANDACE J. MOREY -4- MDL No. 06-1791 VRW	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

information supporting their claims is in the hands of other parties. Non-privileged discovery is likely to reveal additional facts that will contribute to the genuine issues of material fact, thereby warranting denial of the Government's "alternative" motion for summary judgment.

- 4. The information that Plaintiffs intend to uncover through discovery exists in several sources, as outlined below. As a preliminary matter, Plaintiffs would ask the Court to require Defendants to answer the Master MCI and Verizon Consolidated Complaint, the Bready Complaint, the *Chulsky* Amended Complaint, and the *Riordan* Complaint, thereby potentially generating admissions that would support Plaintiffs' claims.
- 5. Under the multi-step protocol of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act ("FISA"), Section 1806(f), whereby Congress superseded the common law state secrets privilege to allow courts to review sensitive material on all motions "to discover or obtain applications or orders or other materials relating to electronic surveillance," 50 U.S.C. § 1806, and under Section 1845(f) authorizing judicial review on motions "to discover, obtain, or suppress evidence or information obtained or derived from the use of a pen register or trap and trace device," 50 U.S.C. § 1845(f), Plaintiffs would propound targeted discovery on MCI and Verizon seeking information on the interception and disclosure of Plaintiffs' communications and records to the Government. To the extent that the Court finds that it needs additional information on the challenged surveillance, and the Government asserts that such information would harm national security, the procedures of Sections 1806(f) and 1845(f) provide for the requisite discovery without undue risk of public disclosure.
- 6. Specifically, Plaintiffs would propound targeted discovery on MCI and Verizon on the existence of the content monitoring program, whereby MCI and Verizon could, among other things, "confirm or deny the existence of a certification authorizing monitoring of communication content through a combination of responses to interrogatories and in camera review by the Court." Hepting v. AT&T Corp., 439 F. Supp. 2d 974, 997 (N.D. Cal. 2006).
- 7. After the *Hepting* opinion was rendered, the Government and Verizon made statements confirming the existence of the Government's domestic monitoring of communications records. See e.g., Ex. HH (March 20, 2007 testimony of FBI General Counsel

Caproni before Congress); Ex. Z (April 11, 2007 statement of Verizon Wireless Regional President Kelly Kurtzman on PBS NewsHour). Plaintiffs would propound targeted discovery on MCI and Verizon on the existence of the records monitoring program, including whether either received certification authorizing monitoring of communications records, through a combination of responses to interrogatories and *in camera* review by the Court.

- 8. Plaintiffs would serve requests for admissions regarding the facts of MCI and Verizon's interception of Plaintiffs' communications for the Government.
- 9. Plaintiffs would serve requests for admissions regarding the facts of MCI and Verizon's interception of Plaintiffs' call records for the Government.
- 10. Plaintiffs would serve requests for admissions regarding the facts of MCI and Verizon's disclosure of Plaintiffs' communications to the Government.
- 11. Plaintiffs would serve requests for admissions regarding the facts of MCI and Verizon's disclosure of Plaintiffs' call records to the Government.
- 12. The Government has previously stated in open court in *Hepting* that AT&T documents obtained by Mark Klein and accompanying declarations, "which documents allegedly demonstrate how AT&T has implemented a warrantless surveillance system on behalf of the NSA" did "not . . . contain classified information." *Hepting*, 439 F.Supp.2d at 979, 989 (citing 6/23/06 Transcript at 76:9-20). The MCI and Verizon Plaintiffs would serve requests for admissions, interrogatories, and document production requests on MCI and Verizon seeking information on their network architecture and the manner in which they keep their call records.
- 13. Plaintiffs would seek to obtain declarations from, or propound depositions on written questions to, the confidential sources quoted in the news reports (set forth in Exhibits described *supra*) to overcome the hearsay nature of the news reports in which they were quoted, to the extent Plaintiffs are able to identify those confidential sources.
- 14. Plaintiffs would take depositions of Qwest executives regarding public statements made by Qwest executives that the NSA asked Qwest to intercept and disclose customer communications and records. *See* Ex. Y.
 - 15. Each of the topics of targeted discovery outlined above is highly likely to yield